



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/612,006	07/07/2000	Clifford Alan Pickover	YO999-467	7649
7590 04/18/2005 OHLANDT,GREELEY,RUGGIERO & PERLE,LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE 10TH FLOOR STAMFOD, CT 06901			EXAMINER QUELER, ADAM M	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/612,006

Applicant(s)

PICKOVER ET AL.

Examiner

Adam M Queler

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-26 and 35-52 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 27-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

47

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 12/27/2004, Remarks filed 08/09/2004.
2. Claims 1-52 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 17, 24, 27, 35, 43, and 50 are independent claims.
3. The rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Election/Restrictions

4. This application contains claims 9-26 and 35-52 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Response of 08/09/2004. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-3, 7-8, 27-29, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rogson (USPN 2002/0010726, filed 3/28/2000).**

Regarding dependent claim 1, Rogson teaches a method of spell-checking a word processing document (para. 1). A word processing document inherently contains a group of the words that

Art Unit: 2179

occur within the document. Since Rogson accesses and reads the document in order to spell check it, the words in the document are determined from the reading of it. Rogson teaches reporting a misspelled word to a user (para. 45). Rogson teaches a dynamic update list keeps track of the most frequently misspelled words (para. 26) and presents a list of replacement words from the list (para. 45). Rogson also teaches that the dynamic update list is tied to the document (para 48, ll. 6-7), therefore the list contains words selected from the group of words that occur in the document.

Regarding dependent claim 2, a word processing document inherently has a group of words that include text from the contents of the file.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Rogson teaches the list is compiled based on frequency of use (para. 26). Rogson also teaches that location is used to determine replacements (para. 43).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Rogson discloses another dynamic list for the user (para. 47).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Rogson discloses another dynamic list for the user. In the case of the first document the user checks, the list would contain the most recent misspellings (para. 47).

Claims 27-29, and 33-34 contain the same limitations as claims 1-3, 7-8, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4-6 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogson as applied to claims 1-3 and 27-29 above, and further in view of Chandrasekar et al. (USPN 6578032, filed 6/28/2000).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Rogson does not explicitly disclose using related words.

Chandrasekar teaches using words related to words found in the document to determine the proper spelling of a word (col. 2, ll. 45-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these topical words to the list, as they would be relevant replacement words (col. 2, ll. 45-49).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Rogson does not explicitly disclose using related words.

Chandrasekar teaches using clustering to find topics related to words found in the document to determine the proper spelling of a word (col. 2, ll. 45-49). This clustering is equivalent to latent semantic indexing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these topical words to the list, as they would be relevant replacement words (col. 2, ll. 45-49).

Regarding dependent claim 6, neither Rogson nor Chandrasekar explicitly disclose an order of words. Chandrasekar does disclose that the related word is used first (col. 2, ll. 39-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to list related words first as they were most likely the correct term (col. 2, ll. 39-45).

Claims 4-6 contain the same limitations as claims **30-32** and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

9. **Applicant's arguments filed 08/09/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.**

Regarding Applicant's remarks on Claim 1:

Applicant alleges that the Rogson does not determine a group of words from the content of a document. However, Rogson teaches a method of spell-checking a word processing document (para. 1). A word processing document inherently contains a group of the words that occur within the document. Since Rogson accesses and reads the document in order to spell check it, the words in the document are determined from the reading of it.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on the remainder of the claims:

The remaining remarks contain similar arguments to those answered above and are considered answered.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2179

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M Queler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4140.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AQ


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100